EXHIBIT 4

```
IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
 1
 2
                   DISTRICT OF UTAH, CENTRAL DIVISION
 3
          CAPANA SWISS ADVISORS
 4
          AG, a Swiss corporation; )
          AMERIMARK AUTOMOTIVE
 5
          AG, a Swiss corporation, ) Videotaped Deposition of:
 6
               Plaintiffs,
                                    )
                                       Brett Breedlove
 7
          vs.
                                       Case No. 2:23-CV-00467
          RYMARK, INC., a Utah
 8
          corporation; NICHOLAS ) Judge:
 9
          THAYNE MARKOSIAN, an ) Hon. Robert J. Shelby
          individual; JOHN
10
          KIRKLAND, an individual; )
                                      Magistrate Judge:
          and Vicky Small, an )
                                       Cecilia M. Romero
          individual,
11
               Defendants.
12
13
14
                       REMOTE PROCEEDING VIA ZOOM
15
16
17
                  October 22, 2024 * 12:10 p.m. (EST)
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
                     Reporter: Diana Kent, RPR, CRR
25
               Notary Public in and for the State of Utah
                                                        Page 1
```

1	(EXHIBIT 48 WAS MARKED.)	03:03:30
2	Q. It's a large document, but just based on	03:03:38
3		03:03:40
	the title page, I'll ask if you have ever seen	
4	A. No. Again, if it was part of the exhibits	03:03:48
5	in the Complaint, I may have scanned it there, but not	03:03:52
6	prior.	03:03:57
7	Q. Okay. So no recollection if Rymark ever	03:03:57
8	provided KSM with this document?	03:04:01
9	A. Correct.	03:04:03
10	Q. And Exhibit 49, KSM 0008011.	03:04:03
11	(EXHIBIT 49 WAS MARKED.)	03:04:18
12	Q. So you see the Bates number, Mr. Breedlove?	03:04:19
13	A. Yes.	03:04:24
14	Q. And you recognize it as a document	03:04:25
15	produced by your firm?	03:04:27
16	A. Yes.	03:04:29
17	Q. And so this is dated September 28, 2023.	03:04:30
18	A. Correct.	03:04:33
19	Q. Have you seen this document before?	03:04:35
20	A. Yes.	03:04:36
21	Q. And what is it?	03:04:37
22	A. This is so during the period of	03:04:39
23	reissuance, we had requested Nick personally to make	03:04:46
24	personal representations regarding ownership of the	03:04:50
25	business and his election to be treated under	03:04:52
	Page 170	

1	Subchapter S of the Internal Revenue Code.	03:04:55
2	Q. Why is that?	03:04:58
3	A. Why is what?	03:04:59
4	Q. Why did you make that request?	03:05:00
5	A. Because of being made aware of the	03:05:05
6	litigation and the challenge, we wanted additional	03:05:07
7	support and his additional representations in the file	03:05:12
8	to support the disclosures in the financial statements,	03:05:15
9	in addition to the tax returns that are filed.	03:05:19
10	Q. So is it fair to say that discovery of the	03:05:21
11	litigation heightened the professional skepticism in	03:05:29
12	some regard?	03:05:32
13	A. Correct.	03:05:33
14	Q. And so part of it was requesting this	03:05:34
15	letter?	03:05:37
16	A. Yes.	03:05:38
17	Q. And so Rymark and KSM restated or you	03:05:39
18	restated the 2022 consolidated financial statements	03:05:48
19	directly because of the discovery of the litigation on	03:05:51
20	August 20, 2023.	03:05:53
21	A. We reissued the financial statements upon	03:05:56
22	discovery of the litigation, correct.	03:05:59
23	Q. And in reviewing those documents and	03:06:02
24	preparing them, did you were you ever provided with	03:06:05
25	the 2016 power of attorney documents that we looked at	03:06:10
	Page 171	